



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/580,454 | 05/30/2000 | Nobuhiro Ono | 192432USRD | 2458 |

7590 12/08/2003

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/580,454

Applicant(s)

ONO ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. The claims 1-9 are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

5. Regarding claim 5, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito, U.S. patent No. 5,649,218, and further in view of Aoyama et al. (Aoyama), U.S. Patent No. 6,526,410.

8. As to claim 1, Saito discloses a document editing system for editing a document in a computer, comprising:

document area management means for discriminating a plurality of document areas specified within an arbitrary area of the document and managing the document areas along with attributes assigned thereto (col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 8, col. 9, lines 36-54 and col. 13, lines 40-56: data in the document is discriminated by tags in order to represent its structure);

tag management means for managing generation and deletion of a tag pair including a start tag and an end tag, which uniquely correspond to each other and specify a document area (col. 9, lines 36-54: structure restoring section 13 restores omitted tags (deleted tags);

However, Saito does not disclose document editing means for editing a character sequence provided in the document while information about the specified document area within the document is retained or updated. In the similar field of endeavor, Aoyama discloses a document editing program 104 for editing document (col. 6, lines 40-57), and the document editing program 104 edits structured documents such as tags or anchors (character sequence) and some parts of the body of the document in Fig. 5A are retained, and other parts are updated in Fig. 5B (Figs. 5A & 5B). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Saito and Aoyama to include document editing means for editing a character sequence provided in the document while information about the specified document area within the document is retained or updated. Aoyama also provides a method for managing the editing of a structured document for a document processing system capable of managing the editing on the basis of comparison and discrimination of the logical structures of structured documents.

9. As to claim 2, Saito and Aoyama (Saito-Aoyama) disclose wherein said plurality of document areas comprise a plurality of types of document areas (Saito, col. 6, lines 5-20).

10. As to claim 3, Saito-Aoyama disclose link management means for performing management operation so as to relate one or a plurality of documents to the specified document area and passing information about the link to said document area management means (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65); and

linked document output means for outputting the document linked by said link management means, by reference to information about the document area managed by said document area management means (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65).

11. As to claim 4, Saito-Aoyama disclose wherein said plurality of document areas comprise a plurality of document areas specified within the entirety of the document or arbitrary portions thereof (Saito, Fig. 14); and

wherein said system further comprises:

display format management means for managing an arbitrary display format assigned to the document area managed by said document management means (Saito, col. 7, lines 24-34); and

document output means for outputting the document managed by said document area management means, in an arbitrary expression format provided in said display format management means (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65).

12. As to claim 5, Saito-Aoyama disclose processing interface management means for performing management operation so as to relate an arbitrary process to the

specified document area such that a trigger for executing the process is set for the specified document, as well as to pass information about the link to said document are management means (Saito, Fig. 2); and

a processing library for storing, such as a library, the arbitrary processes linked to the specified document area by said processing interface management means (Saito, col. 7, lines 2-34).

13. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (Takahashi), and further in view of Ferrel et al. (Ferrel), U.S. Patent No. 6,230,173.

14. As to claim 6, Takahashi discloses a method of preparing a tag information management table for editing a document, said method comprising the steps of:

determining whether or not an arbitrary character string within a document is selected (col. 27, lines 9-36);

if it is determined in said determining step that the character string is selected, acquiring information about the kind of tags assigned to a document area and information about the position of a start tag and that of an end tag (col. 13, lines 5-25);

However, Takahashi does not disclose assigning nonoverlapping tag ids to the respective tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step; and storing into a tag information management table for use in editing a document, a link between the tag ids assigned to the tags in said assigning step and the tag information pieces acquired in

said acquiring step. In the same field of endeavor, Ferrel discloses a tag ID number is generated and put in a Tag ID Lookup Table when the content is linked to a control by the designer, and each tag is converted to a numerical description during the link, and therefore, the tag ID of the node is a number corresponding to a particular tag (col. 33, line 64 – col. 34, line 15 and Fig. 17). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Takahashi and Ferrel to include assigning nonoverlapping tag IDs to the respective tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step; and storing into a tag information management table for use in editing a document, a link between the tag IDs assigned to the tags in said assigning step and the tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step. Ferrel suggests that efficiently transmitting tagged content to a computer in an on-line publishing system to provide content providers with increased flexibility for presenting their content to customers.

15. Claims 7-9 have similar limitations as claim 6; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 (After Final Communications only)

(703) 872-9306 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240 (for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER